



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

DN

APPLICATION NO. 05/779,767	FILING DATE 01/07/97	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ZASHOUANI	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. H ALLIA.143A
-------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

NEED A ISRAELSON  
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON AND BEAR  
16TH FLOOR  
620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE  
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660

HM12/0312

EXAMINER

REEVES, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

16

DATE MAILED: 03/12/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Interview Summary

Application No.

08/779,767

Applicant(s)

Zaghouani

Examiner

Julie E. Reeves, Ph.D.

Group Art Unit

1642



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Julie E. Reeves, Ph.D.(3) Dan Hart(2) Ned Israelson

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Mar 10, 1999Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: all pending

Identification of prior art discussed:

Zanetti et al, Sette et al

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants question 112 first paragraph with respect to the scope of any T cell receptor antagonist. Examiner maintained that it was not clear at what concentration and with what T cell receptor the antagonist would function as antagonist and not an agonist. With regard to the 103 rejection, applicants argued intended use of their composition. The claims recite a composition, not a method of use.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.